REMARKS

Claims 1-42 stand rejected. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 25-27, 30-32, 35, 37, 39- 41 have been amended.

Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 18, 21, 22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,415,294 issued to Niemi ("Niemi").

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, retrieving a first information page having first contents, and then:

> automatically assembling and augmenting the first information page being browsed with one or more information source identifiers directly identifying one or more information pages with second contents that may be additionally retrieved, the one or more directly identified information pages being selected based at least in part on **second keywords determined to be related to first keywords present in the first information page**, and the second contents directly augmenting the first content.

In other words, claim 1 requires, among other things, the client system to augment a first information page based in part on second keywords determined to be related to first keywords present in the first information page. On page 3 of the final office action dated 5/13/2004, the examiner cites (in the discussion of claim 6) Niemi column 4 lines 43-60 and column 5, lines 2-17 for the proposition that Niemi anticipates using second keywords related to first keywords to augment a first information page.

Column 4 lines 43-60 discloses a method of developing, over time, a list of keywords that are present in documents viewed on a client system (see also table 1 column 8, lines 39-48 of Niemi). The cited text also discloses the development of a table of all pages and the keywords contained in those pages (see tables 2 and 3 in column 8, line 52 through column 9, line 9 of Niemi). Additionally, the text in column 5 lines 2-17 discloses a method of continuously updating the keyword database by analyzing each new page as it is downloaded. However, even if one were to

characterize a subset of the keywords in the Niemi database as first keywords and another subset as second keywords, there is no disclosure of any subset of keywords in the Niemi database being related to another subset of keywords.

Furthermore, Niemi discloses in column 5 lines 8-17, scanning the text in a newly-downloaded webpage to identify words in the page that match a keyword database. Next, a hyperlink query is introduced into the webpage based on those keywords. There is no discussion, however, of using second keywords (determined to be related to first keywords) to augment the downloaded page. Thus, Niemi discloses identifying a group of keywords in a page (similar to the "first keywords" in the language of claim 1) but does not use related keywords (the "second keywords" in the language of claim 1) to facilitate augmenting the page being browsed. Rather, Niemi merely uses the *first keywords* to facilitate augmenting the page being browsed.

Thus, Niemi does not disclose each and every element of claim 1 as amended and therefore applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Niemi.

In regards to claims 2, 6, and 11, each depends from claim 1 incorporating all of its limitations. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 6, and 11 are also patentable over Niemi.

As to claim 18, it recites, in a server system, an automated method comprising, *inter alia*:

> receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third party location by the client system a first information page to be browsed on the client system, **first keywords related to presence of second keywords in the first information page**, where at least the second keywords present in the first information page are dynamically determined by the client system in real time on retrieval of the first information page[.]

Thus, claim 18 requires that the server system receive first keywords related to second keywords where the second keywords have been found in a downloaded

page and that the server then augment the downloaded page based on the first keywords.

See the discussion of claim 1 above. Niemi discloses identifying a group of keywords in a page (similar to the "second keywords" in the language of claim 18) but does not use related keywords (the "first keywords" in the language of claim 18) to facilitate augmenting the page being browsed. (To avoid confusion, applicant notes that the "first keywords" of claim 1 are analogous to the "second keywords" of claim 18 and vice versa.)

Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, the applicant submits that Niemi does not anticipate each and every element of claim 18 and that claim 18 is therefore patentable over Niemi.

As to claims 21, 25, and 30, each requires a server system provide to a client information source identifiers based at least in part on second keywords related to first keywords present in a first information page. See the discussion of claim 1 above. Niemi discloses identifying keywords in a page (similar to the "first keywords" in the language of claims 21, 25, and 30) but does not provide information source identifiers based on related keywords (the "second keywords" in the language of claims 21, 25, and 30).

Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, the applicant submits that Niemi does not anticipate each and every element of claims 21, 25, and 30 and that those claims are therefore patentable over Niemi.

As to claims 22, 26, 27, 31, and 32, each depends from one of claims 21, 25, or 30 incorporating limitations from either claim 21, 25, or 30. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, these claims are patentable of Niemi.

As to amended independent claim 35, it now recites a client system comprising, *inter alia*, a browser and:

an information source database having a plurality of first keywords and a plurality of second keywords related to the plurality of first keywords.

As noted above in the discussion of claim 1, Niemi does not disclose a database with second keywords that are related to first keywords. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is patentable over Niemi.

As to claims 36-38, those claims depend from claim 35 thereby incorporating each and every limitation of claim 35. Therefore, for at least the reasons above, claims 36-38 are patentable over Niemi

As to amended independent claim 39, it now recites a server system comprising, *inter alia*, an information source database having a first plurality of keywords, and a second plurality of keywords related to the first plurality of keywords. As discussed with regard to claim 1 above, Niemi fails to anticipate a database with second related keywords and therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, fails to anticipate each and every element of claim 39. Thus, claim 39 is patentable over Niemi.

As to claims 40-42, those claims depend from claim 39 incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, claims 40-42 are patentable over Niemi.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Niemi and US Patent No. 5,913,215 issued to Rubinstein et al ("Rubinstein").

Claims 12-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Niemi and US Patent No. 6,271,840 issued to Finseth et al ("Finseth").

Claims 3-5 and 12-14 depend from claim 1, incorporating its limitations, and therefore, for at least the reasons cited in the above discussion of claim 1, claims 3-5

and 12-14 are also patentable over Niemi. Furthermore, neither Rubinstein nor Finseth cure the deficiency of Niemi; neither discloses augmenting a first information page based at least in part on second keywords related to first keywords present in a first information page. Therefore, the combinations of Niemi with Rubinstein and Niemi with Finseth both fail to disclose each and every element of claims 3-5 and 12-14. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 3-5 and 12-14 are patentable over the prior art.

Likewise, claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18 which, as discussed above, is patentable over Niemi and Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claims 19 and 20, and therefore claims 19 and 20 are patentable over the combination.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 21 which, as discussed above, is patentable over Niemi and Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claims 23 and 24, and therefore claims 23 and 24 are patentable over the combination.

Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 25 which, as discussed above, is patentable over Niemi and Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claims 28 and 29, and therefore claims 28 and 29 are patentable over the combination.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 30 which, as discussed above, is patentable over Niemi and Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claims 33 and 34, and therefore claims 33 and 34 are patentable over the combination.

Claim 38 depends from claim 35 which, as discussed above, is patentable over Niemi and Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claim 38, and therefore claim 38 is patentable over the combination.

Claim 42 depends from claim 39 which, as discussed above, is patentable over Niemi and Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claim 42, and therefore

claim 42 patentable over the combination.

As to amended independent claim 15, it claims a method comprising, *inter alia*, retrieving a first information page and:

> performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, analysis of the first information page to determine presence of first keywords in at least a portion of the content of said first information page, and retrieval of second keywords related to the presence of first keywords[.]

As in the discussion of claim 1 above, Niemi fails to disclose a method involving retrieving second keywords related to first keywords. Therefore, for at least the reasons cited above, claim 15 is patentable over Niemi. Furthermore, Finseth fails to cure the deficiency of Niemi. Therefore, the combination fails to disclose each and every element of claim 15 and it is therefore patentable over the combination.

As to claims 16 and 17, those claims depend from claim 15 incorporating its limitations and so, for at least the reasons cited above, claims 16 and 17 are also patentable over the combination of Niemi and Finseth.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims are in condition for allowance. Entry of the foregoing is respectfully requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: December 18, 2006

/Richard B. Leggett/

Richard B. Leggett
Reg. No. 59,485

U.S. Bank Centre
1420 5th, Suite 3010
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: 206-292-0460